



Corrigendum: Exploring Selective Exposure and Confirmation Bias as Processes Underlying Employee Work Happiness: An Intervention Study

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:

Radha R. Sharma,
Management Development Institute,
India

*Correspondence:

Paige Williams
paige.williams@unimelb.edu.au

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Organizational Psychology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Psychology

Received: 11 January 2017

Accepted: 27 January 2017

Published: 13 February 2017

Citation:

Williams P, Kern ML and Waters L
(2017) Corrigendum: Exploring
Selective Exposure and Confirmation
Bias as Processes Underlying
Employee Work Happiness: An
Intervention Study.
Front. Psychol. 8:182.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00182

Paige Williams *, Margaret L. Kern and Lea Waters

Centre for Positive Psychology, Melbourne Graduate School of Education, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Keywords: work happiness, attitudes, psychological capital, organization culture, organizational virtuousness, selective exposure, confirmation bias

A corrigendum on

Exploring Selective Exposure and Confirmation Bias as Processes Underlying Employee Work Happiness: An Intervention Study

by Williams, P., Kern, M. L., and Waters, L. (2016). *Front. Psychol.* 7:878. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00878

There was a mistake in the Intervention group values at Times 1 and 2 in **Table 1**. The correct version of **Table 1** appears below. The authors apologize for the mistake. This error does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way.

Conflict of Interest Statement: PW was employed at the research site at the time of the study. The other authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2017 Williams, Kern and Waters. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

TABLE 1 | Demographic data for the samples at each time-point.

	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	Treatment (<i>n</i> = 51)	Control (<i>n</i> = 18)	Treatment (<i>n</i> = 51)	Control (<i>n</i> = 11)	Treatment (<i>n</i> = 38)	Control (<i>n</i> = 9)
ROLE						
Teaching	24	4	24	2	24	2
Non-teaching	27	14	27	9	14	7
GENDER						
Male	27	6	27	3	18	3
Female	24	12	24	8	20	6
AGE						
25–34 years	3	3	3	3	2	3
35–44 years	12	2	12	0	9	0
45–54 years	15	5	15	3	11	2
55–64 years	17	7	17	4	13	3
65+ years	4	1	4	1	3	1
TENURE						
New this year	25	0	25	0	19	0
1–5 years	19	4	19	4	13	3
6–10 years	5	4	5	3	3	3
11–15 years	0	2	0	1	0	1
16–20 years	1	1	1	1	1	1
20+ years	2	7	2	2	2	1